

Brent N. Bumgardner (Pro Hac Vice)  
Christie B. Lindsey (Pro Hac Vice)  
Jonathan H. Rastegar (Pro Hac Vice)  
Nelson Bumgardner Casto, P.C.  
3131 West 7th Street, Suite 300  
Fort Worth, Texas 76107  
Telephone: 817.377.3488  
Facsimile: 817.377.3485  
[bbumgardner@nbclaw.net](mailto:bbumgardner@nbclaw.net)  
[clindsey@nbclaw.net](mailto:clindsey@nbclaw.net)  
[jrastegar@nbclaw.net](mailto:jrastegar@nbclaw.net)

Robert W. Hicks (Cal. Bar No. 168049)  
Kenneth R. Wright (Cal. Bar No. 176325)  
Robert W. Hicks & Associates  
14435 Big Basin Way, Suite 151  
Saratoga, CA 95070  
Telephone: (619) 846-4333  
Facsimile: (408) 624-9369  
[rhicks@rwhlaw.com](mailto:rhicks@rwhlaw.com)  
[kwright@rwhlaw.com](mailto:kwright@rwhlaw.com)

Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counter-Defendant  
JONGERIUS PANORAMIC TECHNOLOGIES, LLC.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
OAKLAND DIVISION

JONGERIUS PANORAMIC  
TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,  
Plaintiff,  
vs.  
GOOGLE INC., et al.,  
Defendants.

) Case No.: C 12-03797 YGR  
)  
)  
)  
) **STIPULATION TO STAY LITIGATION  
PENDING THE OUTCOME OF INTER  
PARTES REVIEW**  
)  
) **JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**  
)  
)  
) **HON. YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS**

**STIPULATION TO STAY LITIGATION PENDING  
THE OUTCOME OF INTER PARTES REVIEW**

This stipulation is made among Plaintiff Jongerius Panoramic Technologies LLC (“JPT”), Defendant Google Inc. (“Google”), and Defendant Apple Inc. (“Apple”) (collectively, the “Parties”), by and through their respective counsel. Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-2 and 7-12, the Parties herein agree and stipulate as follows:

1. **Background.** This case is in its early stages. Indeed, discovery has just begun, no claim construction briefs have been filed, and no depositions have taken place. Damages discovery is stayed pending further order of the Court. Docket No. 125.

2. On March 15, 2013, Apple and Google jointly petitioned the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (“PTO”) to conduct an *inter partes* review (“IPR”) of the sole patent-in-suit, U.S. Patent No. 6,563,529 (“the ’529 patent”). A copy of the petition is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

3. On April 5, 2013, the Court entered the Case Management Order. Docket No. 153. Additionally, the Court set a Technology Tutorial for July 10, 2013 and a Claim Construction Hearing for July 17, 2013. *Id.* The Court has not set a trial date.

4. The Parties now seek to stay all deadlines in this case pending the outcome of the IPR. In support of a stay, the Parties represent as follows: (1) by statute, the IPR takes a maximum of eighteen (18) months; (2) the IPR will either eliminate the need for trial or simplify the issues before the Court (e.g., validity issues); (3) staying the lawsuit pending the outcome of the IPR will promote judicial economy by eliminating the possibility of duplicative proceedings during the litigation (e.g., two Claim Construction Hearings); (4) staying the lawsuit pending outcome of the IPR will eliminate the possibility of duplicative discovery (e.g., multiple depositions of party and third party witnesses); and (5) all Parties are in favor of staying the litigation pending conclusion of the IPR.

5. **Legal Standard.** Courts consider three factors in determining whether to stay a case pending a reexamination of the patent-in-suit: “(1) whether discovery is complete and whether a trial date has been set; (2) whether a stay will simplify the issues in question and trial of the case; and (3) whether a stay would unduly prejudice or present a clear tactical disadvantage to the non-moving party.” *Telemac Corp. v. Teledigital, Inc.*, 450 F. Supp. 2d 1107, 1111 (N.D. Cal. 2006) (citation omitted). The Parties agree that the circumstances warrant staying the litigation pending conclusion of the IPR.

6. With respect to the first factor, this case is in its early stages. The Parties represent that: (1) discovery has just begun and no depositions have been taken, (2) no claim construction briefs have been filed, (3) damages discovery has been stayed, and (4) no trial date has been set.

7. With respect to the second factor, the stay will simplify the issues before the Court. The IPR is an administrative proceeding conducted by the PTO for the purposes of determining the validity and scope of an existing patent. *See 35 U.S.C. §§ 301-319, et seq.* Once a petition is filed, the PTO is statutorily required to decide whether to institute a review within three months of the PTO receiving a preliminary response by the patent owner or if no such preliminary response is filed, the last date on which such response may be filed. 35 U.S.C. § 314(b). If the proceeding is instituted and not dismissed, a final determination by the Board will be issued within one year (extendable for good cause by six months). 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11). Thus, the entire review process is completed far quicker than a typical reexamination. Also, unlike a reexamination which proceeds before a patent examiner, an IPR is conducted by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“PTAB”) itself, which will provide valuable expertise for the proceeding. *See 35 U.S.C. §316(c).*

8. At the conclusion of the IPR, the USPTO will issue an order that either: (1) invalidates one or more claims of the '529 patent, (2) affirms the validity of one or more claims of the '529 patent,

1 or (3) amends one or more claims of the ‘529 patent. 35 U.S.C. § 307. If the IPR results in the  
2 invalidity of all of the ‘529 patent claims, there will be no need to litigate this case. Also, once the  
3 PTO makes a decision, all participating parties will be estopped from re-litigating the same invalidity  
4 issues that were raised or reasonably could have been raised during the IPR. *See* 35 U.S.C. §  
5 315(e)(2). Further, the additional prosecution history will help clarify the scope of the claims. This is  
6 particularly true where, as here, a party has requested review of each of the asserted claims of the  
7 patents-in-suit. *See Pragmatus AV, LLC v. Facebook, Inc.*, No. 11-CV-02168-EJD, 2011 WL 4802958,  
8 at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 11, 2011) (staying action pending inter partes reexamination, even before the  
9 PTO determined whether reexamination was warranted, in part because defendant’s request for  
10 reexamination included all claims at issue in the litigation).

11 9. Conversely, if the requested stay is denied and the litigation proceeds parallel to the  
12 IPR, the Court’s claim construction ruling may have to be re-visited after the claims are modified. It  
13 thus makes little sense to construe the terms of the ‘529 Patent, and then expend time, energy, and  
14 resources to litigate the ‘529 Patent, when the IPR could undo some or all of these efforts.

15 10. Staying the litigation pending conclusion of the IPR may also prevent duplicative  
16 discovery efforts. Should the asserted claims of the ‘529 Patent be amended during the IPR, it is  
17 possible that the Parties will seek to re-depose witnesses concerning issues implicated by additional  
18 prosecution history or modified claims. The Parties desire to avoid this possibility.

19 11. With respect to the third factor, all Parties are in favor of the stay. Thus, the stay will  
20 cause no prejudice to any of the Parties.

21 12. Should the Court desire, the Parties will provide periodic updates regarding the status of  
22 the IPR.

1       13.     Subject to the Court's approval, the Parties stipulate that all deadlines in this matter will  
2     be stayed until the IPR is complete. A proposed Order is submitted herewith.

3       14.     For the foregoing reasons, the Parties request that the Court stay this litigation

4

5     Dated: April 12, 2013

Respectfully submitted,

6       \_\_\_\_\_  
7       /s/ *Brent N. Bumgardner*  
8       Brent N. Bumgardner  
9       Texas State Bar No. 00795272  
10      bbumgardner@nbclaw.net  
11      Christie B. Lindsey  
12      Texas State Bar No. 24041918  
13      clindsey@nbclaw.net  
14      Jonathan H. Rastegar  
15      Texas State Bar No. 24064043  
16      jrastegar@nbclaw.net  
17      NELSON BUMGARDNER CASTO, P.C.  
18      3131 West 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 300  
19      Fort Worth, Texas 76107  
20      Telephone: (817) 377-9111  
21      Facsimile: (817) 377-3485

22

23       **ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF**  
24       **JONGERIUS PANORAMIC**  
25       **TECHNOLOGIES, LLC**

26

16     Respectfully submitted,

17       \_\_\_\_\_  
18       /s/ *Charanjit Brahma*  
19       Charanjit Brahma (Cal. Bar. No. 204771)  
20      Kakoli Caprihan (pro hac vice)  
21      Jack Lin (pro hac vice)  
22      Jim W. Fang (pro hac vice)  
23      GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP  
24      2101 L Street NW, Suite 1000  
25      Washington, DC 20037  
26      (202) 331-3100

27

28       Scott J. Bornstein (pro hac vice)  
29       GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP  
30       MetLife Building

31

32       5.     **STIPULATION TO STAY LITIGATION PENDING THE**  
33       **OUTCOME OF INTER PARTES REVIEW**  
34       **C-12-03797 YGR**

200 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10166  
(212) 801-9200

Vera Ranieri (Cal. Bar No. 271594)  
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP  
4 Embarcadero Center, Suite 3000  
San Francisco, CA 94111-5983  
(415) 655-1300

## ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT GOOGLE INC.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ James R. Batchelder  
JAMES R. BATCHELDER  
ROPES & GRAY LLP  
1900 University Ave, 6th Floor  
East Palo Alto, CA 94303  
Telephone: 650-617-4000  
Facsimile: 650-617-4090  
james.batchelder@ropesgray.com

KHUE V. HOANG  
JOSEF B. SCHENKER (pro hac vice)  
ROPES & GRAY LLP  
1211 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036  
Telephone: 212-596-9000  
Facsimile: 212-596-9090  
[khue.hoang@ropesgray.com](mailto:khue.hoang@ropesgray.com)  
[josef.schenker@ropesgray.com](mailto:josef.schenker@ropesgray.com)

PAUL M. SCHOENHARD (pro hac vice)  
ROPES & GRAY LLP  
One Metro Center  
700 12th Street, NW, Suite 900  
Washington, DC 20005-3948  
Telephone: 202-508-4600  
Facsimile: 202-508-4650

paul.schoenhard@ropesgray.com  
**ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT APPLE  
INC.**

**FILER'S ATTESTATION**

I, Brent N. Bumgardner, am the ECF User whose ID and password is being used to file this joint stipulation. In compliance with General Order 45, paragraph X.B, I hereby attest that Charanjit Brahma and James R. Batchelder have consented in this filing.

/s/ Brent N. Bumgardner

Brent N. Bumgardner

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned certifies that a copy of the foregoing was served on counsel for all parties of record on April 12, 2013 via the Court's CM/ECF system.

/s/ Brent N. Bumgardner

Brent N. Bumgardner